

could ensue, should he be allowed to continue his arms build-up. As President Eisenhower once observed, "We are linked to all free peoples not merely by a noble idea but by a simple need. No free people can for long cling to any privilege or enjoy and safety in economic solitude."

I do not take this step lightly. To knowingly spend the precious blood of our sons and daughters and the wealth of this peaceable people, even in the noblest cause, is a burden no sensible man desires. But, in the end, our place in the world as the pre-eminent champion of human rights and human liberty leaves us very little choice.

At the close of his 3rd Inaugural Address, on the eve of our Nation's being drawn into the Second World War, Franklin Roosevelt spoke these words, "In the face of great perils never before encountered, our strong purpose is to protect and to perpetuate the integrity of democracy. For this we muster the spirit of America, and the faith of America. We do not retreat. We are not content to stand still. As Americans, we go forward, in the service of country. . . ."

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. It is both reasonable and necessary.

At its essence, our debate is about the critical need to ensure Saddam Hussein fully understands our resolve to protect our citizens and to promote peace around the world. There is no question we would all prefer it if the path ahead did not include military action. Unfortunately, Saddam Hussein may not allow us that option.

The President and other members of his administration have provided a sober, convincing picture of the threats our nation faces from Iraq's current regime. As the President said earlier this week, "While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from Iraq stands alone because it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place."

And this "one place" is led by an evil, evil dictator who directs his intense hatred toward America, Americans, our interests and our allies.

Iraq's leadership has continued to aggressively pursue the development of weapons of mass destruction to add to his arsenal. We've all talked about these weapons but it's worth spelling out what they can be: chemical weapons, biological weapons and even nuclear weapons. Saddam Hussein has shown his cruel willingness to use such devastating weapons against his own citizens and his neighboring countries in the past. I sincerely doubt he's had a change of heart.

We must also not ignore the support of terrorism found in Hussein's Iraq. September 11, 2001 was a horrific reminder that terrorists are serious in their intent to harm Americans. This step is a continuation of the war against terrorism that our nation has been forced to undertake.

It is Saddam Hussein himself who provides the final proof that we must act. He has a robust history of disregard of the international community and its laws. Time and again, he has willingly and defied the United Nations and the world community by ignoring the agreements he has made. He has constructed a wall of delay and deception that at times is as thick as the cloud of black smoke from the malicious oil fires that greeted our troops in 1991 as they liberated Kuwait.

It's obvious that Iraq's current regime presents problems not just for the United States, but problems for international peace and stability. We can not deny the seriousness of the situation, and I believe America should provide its leadership for the sake of peace and justice.

The President has earned our confidence through his leadership since last fall's terrorist attacks. The President is determined to pursue a course of action with regard to Iraq that will both ensure our own nation's security and promote international stability and I support his efforts.

At the same time, I want to make it clear that I respect those who have sincere opposing views on the question before us. The freedom to disagree is one among many freedoms that we are vigorously trying to preserve and I would never want that to change. Few in Iraq who disagree with Saddam Hussein can share their opinions openly.

The resolution we are considering makes it clear that America prefers to find solutions together with the United Nations and other international leaders. It also provides authority for the President to use force if diplomatic or other peaceful means are not effective. It preserves America's right to act on its own as we must in self-defense of our nation's interests.

Mr. Speaker, the first major vote I took as a Member of Congress in 1991 was to support the international coalition's effort to liberate Kuwait from Iraqi aggressors. No one wanted war then, but it was necessary. No one wants war now. We don't seek it. It is my fervent hope that war with Iraq may yet be avoided. And it may. But our shared and firm commitment to the security of our nation should not be questioned by Saddam Hussein or the world community.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 114, the bipartisan resolution authorizing the use of military force against Iraq.

Like most Americans, I understand that our security is threatened by rogue nations suspected of crafting biological and chemical weapons, and by those who seek access to nuclear weapons. I am convinced that Iraq is building an arsenal of weapons of mass destruction, following repeated refusals, over many years, to comply with United Nations weapons inspections. I believe it is our responsibility to ensure that Saddam Hussein is no longer positioned to pose a major and imminent threat to U.S. national security. I further believe that the President should have the authority to use force against Iraq, if he deems it necessary.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let's get this straight: a preemptive war is a war nonetheless, a war the would-be preemptor starts.

According to our Congressional Budget Office, the aggressive war the President wants to start against Iraq would cost our taxpayers between \$6 and \$9 billion a month. With most people's retirement accounts in the tank, the Federal accounts drenched in red ink and so many people out of work, don't we have better and less violently fatal ways to spend money?

Despite our using parts of Iraq for bombing practice over a ten year period, Iraq hasn't attacked us. But if we carried out a campaign to destroy the regime entirely, what would Saddam have to lose by trying to sneak biological weapons into the U.S.? As we have seen in

Afghanistan, it is not physically possible for us to bottle up a country so that no one can slip away.

A preemptive strike without U.N. Security Council compliance is, by definition, aggression and a treaty violation. A duly entered into treaty is the law of the land. Moreover, the mandate of our Constitution is that Congress alone has the authority to start a war. And the Constitution does not permit Congress to delegate any part of that authority to the President as this proposed resolution would do. In discussing that Constitutional provision (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 11), Congressman Abraham Lincoln wrote in part:

Allow a President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose—and you allow him to make war at pleasure.

There are twenty million people in Iraq not named Hussein. An invasion would kill untold thousands of those already weakened people.

On Saturday the President said, "We must do everything we can to disarm this man before he hurts one single American." Could that possibly mean that the President believes the American soldiers who would be slaughtered in the war he wants to start against Iraq would not be "hurt." Should such stark horror be so casually inflicted on so many young Americans on such flimsy and dubious evidence?

Let's get another thing straight: the al-Qaida did not invent terrorism; it is anything but "a new kind of war." It went on during the reconstruction period in America and periodically since.

Not long ago, President Reagan and Vice-President Bush were telling us one of the good things about their then-friend Hussein was that he was secular and not a religious fanatic. Now suddenly this President Bush is telling us that Hussein is in cahoots with religious fanatics who, even the most casual student of the mideast knows, hate Hussein's guts and would be delighted to overthrow him. Bear in mind that the Bush/Hussein friendship was still going strong after both the Hussein invasion of Iran and his use of gas weapons against his own people.

For 40 years, the Soviet Union was our adversary and was armed to the teeth with awesome nuclear weapons with intercontinental capability that made Hussein the pipsqueak he is. The Soviet Union also slaughtered millions of its own people and invaded neighboring countries. The Soviets were our Saddam Hussein of the time. But no U.S. "preemptive war." Not necessary because the Soviets knew use of nuclear weapons would mean their suicide.

For the sake of argument, let's say Hussein had primitive nuclear weapons now, which he almost certainly does not. He and his gang aren't so dumb that they don't know use of such weapons would mean that he and his "grizzly gang" would be vaporized within minutes by our awesome nuclear capability.

So why war now? Mr. Rove, the White House politics man, is on record as saying that war is good for his party to win elections. Is this, then, a political question or a moral one?

One of the greatest dangers to an American soldier is a poor economy at election time.

In good conscience, I cannot cast my constituents' vote for this latter-day Gulf of Tonkin